

United States District Court
Northern District of California

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

LAURENCE CLAYTON,
Plaintiff,
vs.
TINTRI, INC., ET AL.,
Defendants.

CASE NO. 17-cv-05683-YGR

RUSTEM NURLYBAYEV,
Plaintiff,
vs.
TINTRI, INC., ET AL.,
Defendants.

CASE NO. 17-cv-05684-YGR


**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE AS TO WHY
MOTION TO REMAND SHOULD NOT BE
GRANTED**

Defendant Tintri, Inc. is **ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE** as to why the above-captioned cases should not be remanded to the California Superior Court in and for San Mateo County (the “state court”) for want of subject-matter jurisdiction. Based on the authorities cited in each motion to remand the Court views the motions proper and intends to remand the above-captioned cases to the state court. (*See Claton v. Tintri, Inc., et al*, 4:17-cv-05683-YGR, Dkt. No. 14; *Nurlybayev v. Tintri, Inc., et al*, 4:17-cv-05684-YGR, Dkt. No. 11.)

Defendant shall file oppositions to plaintiffs’ motions in the above-captioned cases by **Friday, October 13, 2017**. Failure to timely file shall be deemed an admission that the motions to remand are proper. Plaintiffs shall file any reply brief by **Monday, October 16, 2017**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 11, 2017



YVONNE GONZALEZ ROGERS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE